

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

MARVIN EUGENE DIXON JR.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TWO UNKNOWN CORRECTIONAL
OFFICER,

Defendant.

8:22CV138

**MEMORANDUM
AND ORDER**

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The court will now conduct an initial review of Plaintiff's Complaint (Filing 1) to determine whether summary dismissal is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A.

I. LEGAL STANDARDS ON INITIAL REVIEW

The court is required to conduct an initial review of "a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity." 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915A(a). On such initial review, the court must dismiss the complaint if it: "(1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief." 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915A(b). *See also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (requiring dismissal of in forma pauperis complaints "at any time" on the same grounds as § 1915A(b)).

"The essential function of a complaint under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is to give the opposing party 'fair notice of the nature and basis or grounds for a claim, and a general indication of the type of litigation involved.'" *Topchian v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.*, 760 F.3d 843, 848 (8th Cir. 2014) (quoting *Hopkins v. Saunders*, 199 F.3d 968, 973 (8th Cir. 1999)). Plaintiffs must set forth enough factual allegations to "nudge[] their claims across the line from conceivable to plausible," or "their complaint must be dismissed." *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*,

550 U.S. 544, 569-70 (2007); *see also Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (“A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.”).

“A pro se complaint must be liberally construed, and pro se litigants are held to a lesser pleading standard than other parties.” *Topchian*, 760 F.3d at 849 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). This means that “if the essence of an allegation is discernible, even though it is not pleaded with legal nicety, then the district court should construe the complaint in a way that permits the layperson’s claim to be considered within the proper legal framework.” *Stone v. Harry*, 364 F.3d 912, 915 (8th Cir. 2004). However, even pro se complaints are required to allege facts which, if true, state a claim for relief as a matter of law. *Martin v. Aubuchon*, 623 F.2d 1282, 1286 (8th Cir. 1980).

II. SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Plaintiff is a pretrial detainee at the Douglas County Correctional Center (“DCCC”). Plaintiff alleges that on October 27, 2021, he was pushed from behind by one of two DCCC correctional officers who were escorting him upstairs. Plaintiff alleges he fell face-forward on the metal steps while he was handcuffed and suffered injuries to his left ribs and shoulder. Plaintiff does not know the officers’ identities, but both are sued in their official capacity for damages.

III. DISCUSSION

Liberally construing Plaintiff’s Complaint, this is a civil rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. To state a claim under section 1983, a plaintiff must allege a violation of rights protected by the United States Constitution or created by federal statute, and also must show that the alleged deprivation was caused by conduct of a person acting under color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

The Constitution affords greater protection to a pretrial detainee compared to a convicted inmate in the sense that “[d]ue process requires that a pretrial detainee not be punished.” *Walton v. Dawson*, 752 F.3d 1109, 1117 (8th Cir. 2014) (quoting *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 535 n. 16 (1979)). In other words, the Constitution shields pretrial detainees not just from “cruel and unusual punishments,” U.S. Const.

amend. VIII, but from *any* punishment whatsoever. *Id.*; see *City of Revere v. Mass. Gen. Hosp.*, 463 U.S. 239, 244 (1983); *Bell*, 441 U.S. at 535 n. 16.

Excessive force claims of pretrial detainees are analyzed under an objective reasonableness standard. *Ryan v. Armstrong*, 850 F.3d 419, 427 (8th Cir. 2017). A court must assess the actions of each officer “from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, including what the officer knew at the time, not with the 20/20 vision of hindsight.” *Id.* (quoting *Kingsley v. Hendrickson*, 135 S. Ct. 2466, 2473 (2015)). A court must also account for the “legitimate interests that stem from [the government’s] need to manage the facility in which the individual is detained,” appropriately deferring to “policies and practices that in th[e] judgment” of jail officials “are needed to preserve internal order and discipline and to maintain institutional security.” *Id.* (quoting *Bell*, 441 U.S. at 520). Factors relevant to assessing the objective reasonableness of force used by officers include:

the relationship between the need for the use of force and the amount of force used; the extent of the plaintiff’s injury; any effort made by the officer to temper or to limit the amount of force; the severity of the security problem at issue; the threat reasonably perceived by the officer; and whether the plaintiff was actively resisting.

Id. (quoting *Kingsley*, 135 S.Ct. at 2473). Also, an “officer may be liable if he does not intervene to prevent the use of excessive force when ‘(1) the officer observed or had reason to know that excessive force would be or was being used, and (2) the officer had both the opportunity and the means to prevent the harm from occurring.’” *Robinson v. Payton*, 791 F.3d 824, 829 (8th Cir. 2015) (quoting *Nance v. Sammis*, 586 F.3d 604, 612 (8th Cir. 2009)).

A suit against a public employee in his or her official capacity is merely a suit against the public employer.” *Johnson v. Outboard Marine Corp.*, 172 F.3d 531, 535 (8th Cir. 1999) (internal citations omitted); see *Baker v. Chisom*, 501 F.3d 920, 923 (8th Cir. 2007) (“A suit against government officials in their official capacities is another way of pleading an action against the entity of which they are agents.”). Douglas County cannot be held liable for the officers’ alleged misconduct under a theory of *respondeat superior* or vicarious liability. “It is only when the ‘execution of the government’s policy or custom ... inflicts the injury’ that the [County] may be held liable under § 1983.” *Brewington v. Keener*, 902 F.3d 796, 801 (8th Cir. 2018)

(quoting *Springfield v. Kibbe*, 480 U.S. 257, 267 (1987) (O'Connor, J., dissenting)). To prevail on an official-capacity claim, Plaintiff must show that the alleged constitutional violation resulted from (1) an official “policy,” (2) an unofficial “custom,” or (3) a deliberately indifferent failure to train or supervise. *Corwin v. City of Independence*, 829 F.3d 695, 699 (8th Cir. 2016).

“Official policy involves ‘a deliberate choice to follow a course of action ... made from among various alternatives’ by an official who has the final authority to establish governmental policy.” *Jane Doe A By & Through Jane Doe B v. Special Sch. Dist. of St. Louis Cty.*, 901 F.2d 642, 645 (8th Cir. 1990) (quoting *Pembaur v. City of Cincinnati*, 475 U.S. 469, 483 (1986)). “Alternatively, a plaintiff may establish municipal liability through an unofficial custom of the municipality by demonstrating ‘(1) the existence of a continuing, widespread, persistent pattern of unconstitutional misconduct by the governmental entity’s employees; (2) deliberate indifference to or tacit authorization of such conduct by the governmental entity’s policymaking officials after notice to the officials of that misconduct; and (3) that plaintiff was injured by acts pursuant to the governmental entity’s custom, *i.e.*, that the custom was a moving force behind the constitutional violation.’” *Malone v. Hinman*, 847 F.3d 949, 955 (8th Cir. 2017) (quoting *Corwin*, 829 F.3d at 699-700). A municipal liability claim based on a theory of inadequate training or supervision is simply an extension of a claim based on a “policy” or “custom” theory of municipal liability. *Marsh v. Phelps Cty.*, 902 F.3d 745, 751 (8th Cir. 2018); *see also Brossart v. Janke*, 859 F.3d 616, 627-28 (8th Cir. 2017) (“A municipality may also be liable where its policies are lawful on their face but municipal action, such as failure to train or supervise, was taken with deliberate indifference as to its known or obvious consequences and led an employee to violate a plaintiff’s rights.”) (quotation marks and citations omitted).

Plaintiff does not allege that the violation of his constitutional rights occurred because of a county policy or custom, or because of a failure to train or supervise corrections officers, nor does his Complaint contain any facts from which it might reasonably be inferred that Douglas County is liable for his alleged injuries. “At a minimum, a complaint must allege facts which would support the existence of an unconstitutional policy or custom.” *Crumpley-Patterson v. Trinity Lutheran Hosp.*,

388 F.3d 588, 591 (8th Cir. 2004) (quoting *Doe ex rel. Doe v. Sch. Dist. of City of Norfolk*, 340 F.3d 605, 614 (8th Cir. 2003)).

Plaintiff's Complaint therefore fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, and is subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A. On the court's own motion, however, Plaintiff will be granted leave to file an amended complaint within 30 days.

If Plaintiff elects to file an amended complaint, he must specify whether each officer is being sued in his official capacity, in his individual capacity, or in both capacities. Plaintiff should endeavor to identify Defendants with as much specificity as possible. Although a complaint must include the names of all the parties, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 10(a), "an action may proceed against a party whose name is unknown if the complaint makes allegations specific enough to permit the identity of the party to be ascertained after reasonable discovery." *Estate of Rosenberg by Rosenberg v. Crandell*, 56 F.3d 35, 37 (8th Cir. 1995).

If official-capacity claims are alleged in the amended complaint, Plaintiff should include enough facts from which "one could begin to draw an inference that the conduct complained of ... resulted from an unconstitutional policy or custom" of Douglas County. *Crumpley-Patterson*, 388 F.3d at 591.

If Plaintiff seeks to hold the officers personally liable for his alleged injuries, he should describe in detail what action was taken by each corrections officer to violate his constitutional rights. "To prevail on a § 1983 claim, a plaintiff must show each individual defendant's personal involvement in the alleged violation." *White v. Jackson*, 865 F.3d 1064, 1081 (8th Cir. 2017).

IV. CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, and is subject to preservice dismissal under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A. On the court's own motion, however, Plaintiff will be granted leave to amend.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff shall have 30 days to file an amended complaint in accordance with this Memorandum and Order. Failure to file an amended complaint within the time specified by the court will result in the court dismissing this case without further notice to Plaintiff.
2. Failure to consolidate all claims into one document may result in the abandonment of claims. Plaintiff is warned that an amended complaint will supersede, not supplement, his prior pleadings.
3. The court reserves the right to conduct further review of Plaintiff's claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A in the event he files an amended complaint.
4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline using the following text: **July 6, 2022**—amended complaint due.
5. Plaintiff shall keep the court informed of his current address at all times while this case is pending. Failure to do so may result in dismissal without further notice.

Dated this 6th day of June, 2022.

BY THE COURT:



Richard G. Kopf
Senior United States District Judge